

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-8 and 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite. Claims 4-8 and 17-24 were rejected to as being dependent upon rejected claims 1-3. Claims 1-8 and 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being directed to subject matter assertedly anticipated by the disclosure of *Tsutsui* (U.S. 5,349,549). Additional informalities were also raised regarding the drawings and abstract of the specification.

The rejection of claims 1-8 and 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph may properly be withdrawn. Claims 1-3 and dependent claims 4-8 and 17-24, have been amended as suggested by the Examiner in order to include proper antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been amended to define “m” as an integer  $\geq 1$ . In claim 2, “n” has been defined as an integer from 0 to N-1. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection has been fully addressed.

The rejection of claims 1-8 and 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), may also be properly withdrawn. The Examiner asserts that *Tsutsui* discloses a limitation of “m” where  $m=0$ . Independent claims 1, 5, 17, and 21 have been amended to define “m” as an integer  $\geq 1$ . Therefore, for at least this reason claims 1-8 and 17-24 are not anticipated by *Tsutsui*.

Moreover, due to the algorithm employed by *Tsutsui*, *Tsutsui* does not fairly suggest any algorithm other than  $m=0$ . Therefore, for at least this additional reason, the claims are patentable over *Tsutsui*.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome in light of the amendments and remarks submitted herewith. No new matter has been added.

In response to further objections raised by the Examiner in claims 1-8 and 17-24, Applicants have amended claims 1-8 and 17-24, as suggested by the Examiner to clarify the expressions and correct idiomatic errors. Claim 9-10, 13-14, 25-26, and 29-30 have also been amended to include proper antecedent basis and correct idiomatic errors.

In response to the objections raised by the Examiner in the specification, the Applicants have amended the specification to correct informalities. In order to avoid abandonment of the instant application, Applicants submit herewith substitution of replacement sheets for Figures 1, 2A-2B, 3A-3D, 4-20, filed herewith for Figures 1, 2A-2B, 3A-3D, 4-20, as originally filed. Particularly, Figures 1 and 2A-2B, which may disclose relevant background information, have been amended in the legend to designate "Prior Art," pursuant to MPEP §609(a)(1) and in compliance with 37 CFR. 1.84. The abstract of the disclosure has also been amended. No new matter is added by this amendment.

In reference to the citations listed on pages 2-3 in the specification, Applicants submit herewith an Information Disclosure Statement and Form PTO/SB08/a for filing in the above-identified application and for consideration by the Examiner.

Therefore, it is submitted that the above amended claims and amendment to the specification address the matters raised in the Office Action.

This response is timely filed. Therefore, no fee is due with this submission. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims 1-32.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 6, 2004

By: 

David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000